2: Lorimer T-3 (1920–4; 1934–5) 1939 AV7 Burusho AV7



use trying to work if it can be avoided with a person you dislike—the game begins. In our regions it was usually possible to find a man with some smattering of Hindustani, Persian, or Pashtu, which helped to speed up the preliminary stages. You get him in, squat him on the floor, and by means of your medium language get hold of a few everyday words:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| father | mother | grandchild | good | bad |
| grass | tree | wheat | arm | leg, etc. |

then the primary colours: *black*, *white*, *red*; the numerals, pronouns, and a few simple time-expressions.

Oddly, many non-European languages have only one word for *blue* and *green*, but you take refuge in *blue as the sky*, "*blue*" *as grass*. Again, oddly as it seems to us, many have ambiguous time-expressions that look indifferently before and after (like the French *tout à l'heure*) so that *yesterday* is the same as *tomorrow*, i.e. one day before or after to-day.

The next most urgent item is, of course, the verb. You choose the seemingly simplest verbal idea "to have" but immediately strike a snag. *I have a stick* seems straightforward enough to an English mind, but you extract only "the stick is with me," "the stick is beside me," "the stick is in my hand"; there is, in fact, no verb "to have." So you take *to go* and try to get the forms of the present tense: *I go*, *thou goest*. . . . Bearing in mind that your man has no idea of grammar, you will not be surprised or daunted by arriving at something of this sort:

| | |
|---|---|
| I'm off | we're making a move |
| thou goest | you are clearing out |
| he's starting | they flee |

You're an old hand and you guess at once that the verb is not bedevilled, but that you have got a clue to six verbs instead of one and to the future as well as to the present tense. Pursuing the past tense of a verb which lets its action be graphically illustrated you may extract something like:

| | |
|---|---|
| Yesterday I smote | We had beaten |
| thou hast hit *or* banged | you thrashed |
| he struck | they whacked *or* belaboured |

2: Lorimer T-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1939 AV7 Burushо AV7

again with a merry assortment of different roots and a confusion of various shades of past-ness. All these various things you ultimately succeed in pigeon-holing.

According to the intelligence of your man—and many of these untutored folk are quite as intelligent as the average headmaster or Oxford don—and the amount of time you have to spare and the intricacy of the language (Burushaski being at least ten times as difficult as Shina or Khowar) your rate of progress will vary. In any case, you will find that, however bright and willing your informant, he is wholly unused to sustained concentration, and must immediately be released at the first sign of weariness or boredom. Also that you must spend many hours working through and sorting your notes and tabulating your results before the next interview, if this is to be profitable.

It was DL's practice to escape at the first possible moment from the thraldom of the intermediate language. First because translation from another tongue is always liable to distort and colour the speaker's own idiom, and secondly because both your and your informant's knowledge (especially his) of the second language is imperfect and often inaccurate, and the amount you actually have in common very limited. It is therefore at best an untrustworthy crutch.

You then bid him think over some short narrative—a fairy tale, an anecdote of real life (a wedding, a funeral, or a raid)—and be prepared to tell it to you very slowly. It is not the affair of a day to train him to speak at a pace you can carefully record, and at first if he has outstripped you and is asked to "say that again" he will repeat himself in totally different words till your text is an agglomeration of bewildering anacolutha.

Having got a first short text on to paper phonetically—without being at all clear of its meaning or the right division of words—and having deciphered of it what you can, you read it aloud to him next day, making corrections as required, and if *he* can understand it, you have made your first step forward. The more unsophisticated he is, the more enchanted he will be to hear his own words again verbatim, and you are half way to making a philologist of him; you have, at any rate, enlisted

2: Lorimer T-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1939 AV7 Burusho AV7



124 relatively strange woman clearing up after a day's work and breezily accosted her: "*Jú no*, sister, I see you are sweeping up the threshing floor with your little bastard." In extenuation I may remark that the words for "broom" and "bastard" differ only in ending in *s* and *sh* respectively, and that the *s*-one turns its *s* into *sh* in the plural. Any offence that might have been given was quenched in the delighted laughter of the people with me, but I was afraid to talk of brooms, whether singular or plural, for many a day.

Even at the end of fifteen months of strenuous practice in talking (and several years of preceding hard work), neither of us had acquired the skill or fluency in speaking that would have rewarded the same effort and goodwill expended on a language like Persian, German, or Shina. The most confirmed language-smatterer could not truthfully say that Burushaski is an easy language to "pick up." It may amuse the reader to know something of the snags that it holds for the unwary—and the wary, too.

193 Burushaski rejoices in four noun categories, roughly corresponding to "genders" in Greek or Latin, but not, as will be seen, based on sex-distinction. If, however, we think of the gender eccentricities of French and German we may indeed question whether grammatical gender in the European languages is really sex-linked as our terminology implies. Professor Meinhoff has other theories about its origin.

Be that as it may, Burushaski divides its nouns into names denoting human male and female—which is straightforward enough—but treats the names of all non-human, living animals as belonging to Class 3, cows and bulls, cocks and hens, mares and stallions alike, while including in the same class the names of a large number of inanimate concrete objects. Class 4 comprises the names of all abstract things—heat and cold, kindness and dreams—of all inanimate objects of indefinite shape and form (such as flour, water, cloud, and sand) besides a distressing number which might seem to belong equally well to Class 3 but just don't.

Amusing facts are that the same word in Class 3 denotes an *apple*, but in Class 4 an *apple tree*; in 3 the belly of a living

2: Lorimer T-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1939 AV7 Burusho AV7



animal or person, in 4 of a dead one, and that while the singular *foot* belongs to 3 the plural *feet* belongs to 4—explain this last phenomenon who can. 193

These categories might matter little, but that adjectives have inflected forms that must agree, and that in certain forms the verbal endings, in others the verbal prefixes, vary according to the class of the subject, or it may be of the object. The word "is," for instance, may be: *bai*, *bo*, *bi*, or *bila*, according to whether the subject is Class 1, 2, 3, or 4.

As if this were not enough, some of the commonest actions of everyday life require to be expressed by a totally different verb according to the class to which the object belongs. There is no one imperative for "Give me!" It will be *jar jao*, *jar achi*, or *jar aghun* according to what is to be given. So with *bring* and *eat*.

Nor does this exhaust the vagaries of the noun. A large number of nouns denoting relationship, parts of the body, or any object intimately associated with its owner, do not exist at all in an independent form. The attitude of mind underlying this phenomenon is not illogical. A *mother*, a *hand*, a *set of bedclothes* cannot be conceived *in vacuo*; they must belong to somebody. A set of seven prefixes gives the clue to whose they are, and none of these "starred nouns" (as we called them for convenience) can be used without the appropriate prefix. There are therefore seven words for *mother*: mine or thine, his or hers, ours, yours or theirs. If all the prefixes conveniently ended in a consonant, or if none of the starred roots began with a vowel, the two component parts of the starred word could be simply juxtaposed. This is unfortunately not the case. All the prefixes end in a vowel, and when the hypothetical root-word has an initial *a-*, *i-*, or *u-* this blends with the vowel of the prefix to form a new combination, so that in practice you are confronted with four times seven possible pronominal prefixes for starred nouns.

Add to this the fact that there are thirty-eight possible endings for the plural, and you know most of the worst about the Burushaski noun.

It would be too much to hope that the verb would be any

193 simpler. Nor is it. The actual conjugation shows a gratifying regularity in the final inflections for tense and person. A proportion of intransitive verbs, however, demand a set of pronominal prefixes (the same possible twenty-eight as those required by the starred nouns) which vary according to the subject; some transitives require these prefixes to denote their direct object, others again to denote their indirect object.

A very large number of verbs or verbal participles, moreover, enjoy a separable prefix of their own after which the pronominal prefixes are infixed, not without suffering phonetic modification in the process. The sort of way this works out may be shown by one example: "Having gone" is represented by:

| | |
|---|---|
| nán | (if it is I who have gone) |
| nukón | (thou) |
| nín | (he) |
| numón | (she) |
| nimén | (we) |
| namán | (you) |
| nún | (they) |

The perfect tense of *to come*, "I have come, etc." is:

daiyaba
dukówa
díbai, díbi, díbila
dumóbó
dimébán
dawábán
duwán, dubien, díbitsen

paradigms displaying a logical symmetry but not to be commanded at a moment's notice. DL and I used to say that given a pencil and paper and twenty spare minutes we could say a great many things in Burushaski with commendable accuracy, but to keep a brisk dialogue going without blundering required more mental agility than perhaps we had any right to hope for in middle life.

Lest all this should seem too childishly simple: a transitive verb can be formed from almost any intransitive by a simple lengthening of the vowel in the first root syllable and the

2: Lorimer T-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1939 AV7 Burusho AV7



193 prefixing of an *a*; a further lengthening of the vowel will convert the same transitive into a causative. If the three verbs are clearly said one after the other, the difference is easy to distinguish, but I know no form of conversation in which the speaker wants to perform this feat. When one verb is heard alone in the quick current of colloquial speech I defy the beginner to be always certain which vowel-length has been employed.

193 Another bewildering trick of Burushaski speech—the im-
194 portance of which I must confess we did not at once discern—is that almost any word may mean its exact opposite if pronounced with lengthened vowel and a different tone of voice. If you ask what sort of a horse a would-be seller has brought, the answer *yashkian* may mean either "a very suitable, satisfactory beast for you to ride," or alternatively "a miserable nag you could not be seen on." You need to know. It is best to go and look. *Caveat emptor*, anyhow! Similarly, if I asked Zaidu how much flour we had left in store and he replied *kaman*, this might be interpreted "a good deal, quite enough for the present," or "just a little," or "very, very little indeed."

This playing on vowel length, quality, and tone is carried to amazing lengths. The only kind of parallel I can think of in English is a child's use of *tiny* as less small than *teeny-weeny*, or the onomatopœic *squeak* denoting a thinner, less important sound than *squawk*. The Burusho can imply admiration, ridicule, contempt, degrees of size, importance, loudness, and what not by skilful sleights of vowel play. The only mild approach we can make to this in English is when by our intonation and expression we can say: "He's a fine fellow, ha is," and give it to be understood that the remark is ironical But *we* use this phonetic irony with extreme economy, whereas it is lavishly employed in Burushaski.

601 A particular snare into which I was apt to fall—though on paper I could have passed a stiff examination on the facts—lay in this: prefixes apart, Burushaski has no one word for *brother* or *sister*. If said by a boy, *acho* means "my brother"; if said by a girl "my sister." This form of the word means, in fact,

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



114 128 the painstaking energy with which, despite many difficulties, he has prosecuted this pioneer undertaking.

The writer of these prefatory pages, who has had the privilege of discussing with the author a number of questions relating to Burushaski, can testify to the accuracy and care which has been bestowed upon the work.

In scientific importance Burushaski may be classed under several categories. Each of these presents its own special problems which will require separate and detailed study, and here it is only possible to draw attention to a few points selected more or less at random.

---

193 In the first place Bu. is of interest to the student of general linguistics on account of the many peculiar features of its morphological structure. These have been described in detail in the Grammar, and I shall only mention here one or two which seem worthy of consideration.

The division of nouns, etc., into four classes[1] is, of course, one of the outstanding features of Bu. grammar. L. is, no doubt, right in considering the first two categories (m. and f.) to be subdivisions of a common class denoting human beings (h.). The plural endings, the demonstrative and interrogative pronouns, and the numerals are the same in m. and f. nouns, and it is only in 3 sg. of the prefixed pronouns and of the personal suffixes of the verb that the two classes differ. This is an interesting parallel to the Indo-European gender system, in which the distinction between m. and f. is supposed to be more recent and less fundamental than that which exists between m. and f. on the one hand and n. on the other.[2]

Of course, the Bu. x. and y. categories cannot be indentified with the I. E. n. As a matter of fact, the x. class, which among other things comprises non-human animate beings and which may, with great reserve, be defined as denoting individually conceived objects,

[1] §§ 19 sqq.

[2] V. e.g. Meillet, BSL (CR), 31, 7.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



rangw in several particulars with the h. (m. and f.) group. Thus the pl. endings to a great extent agree with those of h.; the prefixed pronoun 3 pl. is *w-* in h. and x, but *i-* in y.; and we find yanas *to take* with h. and x. objects, but ganas with y. objects[1], and in Nagiri Bu. and Werchikwar the y. form of the 3 sg. of the verb *to be* is formed from a root *d-*, while h. and x. have the usual *b-*.[2]

This seems to show that y. stands apart from the three first categories.

A definition of the x. and y. categories is given by L. in § 25, note. In most cases x. nouns appear, as indicated above, to denote objects conceived as separate, individual units, while y. might, perhaps, be said to designate 'amorphous substances', including what we would call abstract ideas. Cases like bayundo x. *'bread'*, but y. *dough*, and the fact that the names of coarser cereals (where each single grain is considered as a separate unit) are x., while finer grains are y., give a good idea of the underlying central conception. The distinction between ba'lt x. *apple* and ba'lt y. *apple-tree*, etc. indicates a conception of the fruit-bearing tree as a kind of non-individual, common substance of which the single fruits are made.[3] But in many cases the principle of distinction seems quite obscure, cf., besides the examples given on p. 24, e.g. i'ran x. *cream*.

Regarding the trace of still another category cf. § 187.

At any rate the detailed and well-considered account of the Burushaski nominal classes given in this book will be sure to prove valuable for our understanding of the complicated problems connected with the origin and nature of such classifications.

Another interesting feature of Bu. grammar is the constant use of possessive prefixes with most nouns denoting Parts of the Body., Relatives and "certain things which usually stand in close relation

[1] § 231. Cf. yalas trans. and galas intr. *to break*.

[2] V. §§ 496 and 527.

[3] Quite a different conception is found in Lat. malus f. *apple-tree*: malum n. *apple!* — Regarding Prof. Varma's theory about "x" v. p. 24.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



●193 to some being".[1] This inability to consider certain objects without any relation to a possessor is shared by many languages.[2] Those of Melanesia, especially, present great similarities to Bu. in this respect.[3] But even in some Indo-Aryan dialects of the North-West, e.g. in Pashai, I have come across individuals who, when asked about the words denoting parts of the body or relatives, would preferably answer dandēm '*my* tooth', puθlem '*my* son', etc. This is certainly due to common psychological factors and not to the influence of a hypothetical Bu. substratum in Pashai.

According to Bleichsteiner[4] Leitner states in his Hunza and Nagyr Handbook that when he first heard Bu. of Nagir, every genuine Bu. noun had a pronominal prefix, but that the use of these possessives had decreased when he studied the language again 21 years later. In Leitner's 'The Languages and Races of Dardistan' embodying material collected during his first tour in 1866 and published in 1878[5], the use of the prefixes is, however, restricted to the names of parts of the body and of relatives, and the same principle prevails in Biddulph's material, which was collected in 1876.

Besides this, it is intrinsically improbable that the general use of the prefixes should have been given up in Nagir within such a short space of time, and that a parallel development should have taken place in Hunza and Yasin at a somewhat earlier date. Obviously the distinction between prefixed and nonprefixed nouns is, in its principle, very ancient and 'primitive'.

The details described in §§ 126—133 are very curious. Why, for example, is one word for "stick" used with a prefix, but another not? *Under-* and *upper-bedding* and *pillow* are conceived as belonging to a certain person, but this is not the case with articles of dress, etc.

[1] § 128.

[2] Cf. Havers Handbuch d. erklär. Syntax. p. 111.

[3] Cf. Lévy-Bruehl, La possession dans les langues mélanésiennes, MSL. 19, 6 sqq.

[4] P. 301 of the work quoted below, p. XIII f. n.

[5] Acc. to LSI, VIII, 1, p. 551. My copy of the book bears no date.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



193

*Life* can be spoken of in the abstract, but *death* only with reference to somebody. As regards the names of parts of the body those which like *blood*, *brain*, *skin* etc. denote a "substance" have no prefixes, nor are they used with recent loan-words such as muč *fist*, pini *leg*, but *shoulder-blade*[1], etc. *Bone* and *horn* may be considered either as substances or as parts of the body belonging to a certain person or animal. Consequently we find both tin *bone*, tur *horn* and -ltin, -ltu·r (y!).

One very curious employment of the pronominal "prefix" is as an *infixed* object in the verb šiᵊas, etc. *to eat*[2] This may be the last remnant of a verbal system which has been given up in modern Bu.

Among other peculiarities of the nominal inflexion I shall only draw attention to the interesting "double plural"[3] and to the circumstance that the interrogative pronoun mɛn is a plural (probably originally irrespective of number), of which the sg. is mɛn-ʌn *'who-one?'* Note also complicated formations such as eᵊyɛnmur *'to a daughter of his'*,[4] i-e. "i-ay-ɛn-mo-ɔr *his-daughter-one-f.-to*".

The temporal inflexion of the verbs is dominated by the existence of two temporal bases. From each base three tenses are formed:[5] From the Present Base present, imperfect and future, from the Past Base preterite, perfect and pluperfect. The resulting system agrees completely with that of Shina as expounded by L.,[6] and resembles to some extent the Latin one.

Of general interest are also the indiscriminate active and passive use of some verbal forms[7], the "Static Participle"[8], the addition

[1] But -phoi, L. -phoiŋ *shoulder*, which may have been borrowed at an earlier date.
[2] V. § 252.
[3] § 41 and Corrigenda, pp. 453—54.
[4] § 57.
[5] V. §§ 210 and 274.
[6] Cf. Lorimer, JRAS, 1927 pp. 739 sqq.
[7] V. § 346.
[8] §§ 329 sqq.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



193 of the Pronominal Prefix to the Past Participle Active[1], and the use of finite verbal forms with case suffixes.[2]

601 One detail regarding the vocabulary deserves special notice. The word -aço denotes both '*a man's brother*' and *a woman's sister*. The German tranalation would be *Geschwister von demselben Geschlecht*. A similar conception is found in the word -rik *wife's brother*, *husband's sister*, (*a woman's*[3]) *brother's wife*, (*a man's*) *sister's husband* (but not *wife's sister* or *husband's brother*). Apparently this word denotes *a brother- or sister-in-law belonging to the same sex as the person in relation to whom he or she is mentioned*. Note that *woman's brother* (-ulus) and *man's sister* (-yas) are denoted by separate words.

I have not met with this curious nomenclature in other languages, and I do not know to what kind of special structure of the family group it may originally have been due.

---

197 If we turn to the important question of the genealogical relations between Bu. and other languages, we are faced by great, perhaps insurmountable difficulties, *inter alia* because we possess no ancient records of the language and have only the closely related Werchikwar dialect to compare it with.

One fact, however, seems quite certain and indisputable: Bu. is not related to any of the surrounding Indo-Iranian, Turkish or Tibetan languages.

If we exclude A. Hyde's claim that Bu.[4] has a Siberio-Nubian origin, the first attempt to determine the position of Bu. was made by Ph. L. Barbour[5] who suggested the possibility of a connection with the Munda languages (Santali etc.). In spite of the great anthropological difference between Burusho and Mundas this hypo-

[1] § 326.
[2] § 407.
[3] Cf. Texts, p. 384.8 where a-rikmo *my brother's wife* is said by a girl.
[4] Indian Antiquary, I, 258 (quoted LSI, VIII, 2, 551).
[5] JAOS, 1921, p. 60 sqq.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



tenuis by a media in loan-words. Thus Bu. baša *turban* < Shina paṣo; Bu. gu'pas, W. γu·pas (Leitner kupásya) *cotton* (*thread*) < Indo-Aryan, cf. Skr. karpāsa; Bu. gi·li *peg* < Shina ki·li, etc. Probably Bu.-W. initial surds have become voiced in certain, as yet unknown, circumstances.[1] This change has taken place late enough to affect even loan-words, and cannot go back to a common Bu.-Cauc. period.

Morphology. I. Nominal Classes. The Bu.-W. system of nominal classes is undoubtedly in general accordance with that of several N.E. Cauc. languages. I admit that I have always been impressed by the similarity in this respect between Bu. and Andi, which together with some other Daghestan languages has four classes: 1) m., 2) f., 3) animals and some dead objects, 4) all the rest.[2]

But we must not forget: a) That similar systems of classification appear in other languages as well. b) That it has not as yet been shown that the 4th class of Andi etc. is based upon the same conception as the Bu. y. class.[3] c) That other N.E. Cauc. languages have up to eight classes and that we are not in a position to assert that the four-class system in the original one. d) That the formation of the classes and their use differs, as admitted by Bl., considerably in Bu.-W. and Cauc. The similarity between the *t* in Bu. gu-tɛ *this* (y.) and the *t'* in Archin ya-t' *this* (4th class)[4], has very little significance in view of the great number of varying class-elements in Cauc. which differ altogether from those in Bu.

On the whole I am inclined to believe that the existence of nominal class-systems in Bu. and Cauc. cannot be taken as more than an indication of the *possibility* of relationship.

II. The parallelism between the use of possessive prefixes in Bu.-W. and N.W. Cauc. is less striking than that mentioned

[1] Cf. also ki-ne h. *this*: gu-se x., gu-te y. — But note tiṣti *span* < diṣti- (v. below p. XXIII!)

[2] Cf. Bl., p. 299, Dirr., Einführ. in die kauk. Spr. p. 183.

[3] Жирков, Грамматика Даргинского языка does not give any information on this point.

[4] Including, *inter alia*, sexually immature animate beings — a conception unknown to Bu.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



193
197

above[1] between Bu. and Melanesian. Bl. mentions the 'remarkable identity between Bu. 3 sg. i- and Cherkhess ji-, Abkhas j-[2] but forgets to mention Ubykh gi- which points to a different origin of the Cherkh. and Abkh. forms.

III. The number of plural suffixes in Bu.-W. is very considerable[3]. It seems reasonable to assume that many of them have been converted to this use at a comparatively recent date, and the similarity which Bl. detects between Bu. -a, -i[4], -ik, -ko, -nts, etc. and Akhwakh -a, Chechen -i, Abkhaz -k'ua, -cwa[5] is not very impressive.

IV. Declension. The use of a special Agential case for the subject of a transitive verb is common in Cauc. In Bu. it is the rule when the verb is in a past-base tense, and it is found occasionally with present-base tenses.[6] The construction of the transitive verb varies, however, very much in the Cauc. languages[7] and in most cases it is passive in contradistinction to Bu. In Shina, where the construction is very similar to that of Bu., it may be due to the influence of a Bu. substratum, but this cannot be the case with Tibetan. Moreover, we must remember that a passive construction of the past tenses with the subject in the agential case is also used in most Indo-Iranian languages. I do not think, therefore, that the partial agreement between Bu. and Cauc. in this respect affords any strong indication of relationship.

The phonetic similarity between the Bu. agential ending -e and the -ē, -iē, -a, -o etc. of certain Cauc. languages may easily be accidental.

V. The Adjective. The expression of the comparative by the formular 'x is big *from* y' is common to very many languages besides Bu. and N. E. Cauc.

[1] V. p. X.
[2] Bleichsteiner's j = our y.
[3] §§ 27 sqq.
[4] Only in hiri *men*.
[5] Only of rational beings.
[6] § 60.
[7] V. Dirr., pp. 62—76.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920–4; 1934–5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



I cannot perceive any striking similarity between the Bu.-W. type šika-m *grass-ish*, i.e. *green* and Mingrelian čil-am-i '*married (man)*' from čil-i *wife*.

VI. Numerals. The vigesimal system is used in Bu. and in most Cauc. languages, but also in a great number of other languages, e.g. in N. W. India, and it cannot be used to prove genealogical relationship.

VII. Pronouns. Bl. compares the Bu. pronouns with Cauc. ones. Opening, at random, a grammar of the West African Ewe language, I cannot help thinking that one might make out as strong a case for comparing the pronouns of this language with Bu. Cf.:

| | Bu. | Udic | Kürin. | Tsakhur | Awar | Ewe |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *I* | jɛ[1] | zu | zun | zə | dun | nye |
| *Thou* | u-ŋ, gu-[2] | un | wun | γu | mun | wo[2] |
| *We* | mi | yan | čun | :ši | nit: | miawo (Abure ame). |
| *You* | ma | wàn | k'u-n | šu | nuž | mía ( „ ama). |
| *He*, etc. | i- (nɛ etc.) | šeno | am(a) | man(a) | doŋ | (y)e. |
| *They* | u-ɛ | šonor | àbar | manbo | dol | wo. |
| *Who?* | amin | šu | | ha-: šu-nä | amę ka. | |

VIII. The Verb. Bl.'s comparison of the Bu. infinitive in -as, (which is a noun taking case suffixes) to the dativa1 form in -as, -es of some Daghestan languages is not convincing.

Somewhat more striking is the accordance between Bu. n- which forms the Past Ptc. and Georgian na-, used in the same way. But we must remember, that the odds are greatly in favour of finding some elements resembling those of Bu. among the heterógenous mass of Cauc. languages, between whose different groups the relationship has yet to be established.

An objective conjugation is found both in Bu. and in S. Cauc. (Georgian). I know nothing about the history of the Georgian forms in question, but the addition of an element denoting the object is

[1] Which might easily be derived from a conjectural *ŋjɛ. — I agree with Bl. that there is no reason to derive the Bu.-W. forms — with Zarubin — from Ir.

[2] Which might be derived from *(u)ɣu, cf. N. Chinese ɣ- > w-.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



●193
197

common to so many languages that is does not prove any genealogical relationship.[1] In Bu., with its pronominal prefixes, the development of an objective conjugation is only to be expected.

The pl. forms of the Bu. pronominal prefixes are, of course, used to denote a plurality of objects. This has certainly nothing to do with the Abkhaz constructions of the type i-z-bl-ueit *I burn it* (: *it- I burn-ing*): i-z-bal-k'-ueit *I burn several things*, where *i-* is the pronominal prefix denoting the object.[2]

An interrogative particle -a, -e is found in most Indian and Ir. languages adjoining Bu. It might, of course, be considered to be of Bu. origin, but this is by no means certain, and the similarity to the -a, -ë of some Cauc. dialects may easily be accidental.

Vocabulary.

Still more dangerous than the comparison between structural and inflexional elements in Bu. and one or other of the numerous Cauc. languages is the search for lexicological correspondences at the present state of our knowledge of Cauc. If we have to reject most of the comparisons proposed by Bl., it does not mean that they are all necessarily wrong. It is quite conceivable that one may at some future date be able to sift them, and that some of them may, after all, prove to be correct.

But at any rate it will be necessary to apply other methods than those borrowed by Bl. from Marr. The derivation of Bu. huk *dog* from *hoɣor in order to compare Budukh ɦor, Awar hoj, Mingrelian joɣori, Sumerian ur, etc., and the association of this group of words with Bu. hal *fox* is only too typical of Bl.'s methods.

Bu. har *bull*, hare *barley*, herča *to weep*, huk *dog* are compared with Mingrelian ɦoji, k'eri, n-gara-gara and joɣori, and huk *dog*, huyës *herd of goats*, huʰïs *boy*, huṭes *foot* with Awar hoj, k'uj (*sheep*), 'oloqan (*young bull*) and ɦeṭe, without any attempt to establish any system of regular phonetic correspondences between Bu. and the Cauc. language in question.

[1] Cf. e.g. Pashai (Indo-Aryan) degg-ey-ām *'I see thee'*, digg-im-ai *thou seest me*, etc.

[2] Note that the Abkhaz pron. prefix 3 pl. is r-, not k'-.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



Moreover several obviously Indian or Iranian loan-words in Bu. are used to demonstrate the relationship with Cauc.

On the whole, most of Bl.'s comparisons are unsatisfactory and are based on a slight and illusive similarity of sound. Cases like Bu. girkis *rat:* Karata herḳwa, Awar hiniu, Varkun qurka; Bu. tatas *palm of the hand:* Georg. t'ot'i *paw*[1]; Bu. čumu (Shina čimu) *fish:* Mingrelian čẖomu etc. are not sufficient evidence for us to build far-reaching conclusions on. Some kind of connection is perhaps possible between Bu. bičil *pomegranate:* Georg brec'onli[2]; Bu. tili *walnut:* Georg. t'ẖili; Bu. šoγori *a kind of pear:* Budukh čüγür, Tabass. šeẖer[3], but such words may easily wander from one language to another.

I do not think that Bl. has succeeded in proving the probability of a relationship between Bu. and Cauc., and I very much doubt whether it is possible to prove anything of that kind at present. But the whole problem will certainly deserve a renewed and methodical consideration when the Cauc. languages and the connection between their different groups have become better known. And if we ever succeed in connecting Bu. with some other group of languages, it will be of the greatest importance for our understanding of the early history of Western Asia.

---

Our chances of ever being able to reconstruct older forms of Bu. either by comparisons with W. or by means of internal evidence in Bu. itself are not very promising.

Only in very rare cases is it possible to employ the latter method. We have mentioned above[4] that initial mediae may go back to older tenues.

Another case where a reconstruction seems possible is that of the pl. suffix -o.[5] Before this suffix certain consonants are palata-

[1] "Cf. Bur. *-to-to *paw*". Lorimer 2—4—1935.

[2] Acc. to Bl. himself this comparison is 'zweifelhaft'.

[3] Taken from Erckert's not very reliable material.

[4] P. XV.

[5] P. 26 sqq.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



197
●193

lised, n into y, ts into č, s into š. This seems to indicate that the original form was *-yo, which may have been preserved in ɣaiyo, pl. of ɣa *crow*.

Somewhat more doubtful is the supposition of a formative *-y- in the present base of verbs on the evidence of the change of n > y, k and s > š, ts > č, t > č, š, l > lj[1] in Bu. and W. It this is the case, the regular pres. base in -ič- must be a secondary, analogical formation.

Regarding the change of ny > y cf. Bu. ya: W. nya *bear*. But in internal position we have also W. ny > y, e.g. in žakuyu *asses* from žakun.

It is tempting to suppose that a·ltan, a·lta *two* and a·ltambo *eight*, wa·lto *four* are somehow or other related. a·ltər *twenty* must evidently be connected with a·lta, but it is quite uncertain whether it ought to be analysed as alt + tər, cf. to·r-umo *ten*. The similar ending of tsundo *five* and miši·ndo *six* may be due to a secondary adaptation. The 'Ablaut' in hin h., hik z.: han x., y. *one*, and the 'Umlaut' in usko x., y.: i·ski z. *three*; tsundo h., x., y.: tsindi z. *five*; to·rumo: to·rimi *ten* are too isolated to render possible any explanation. Cf. also, however, ɛtimi *he made*, etc.: ɛtumo *she made*, possibly from *ɛtum-i, *ɛtum-mo.

As mentioned above, Nagir Bu. di·la *it is* (y.) di·lum it was (y.), W. du·wa, du·lum are more original forms than Hunza bila, bi·lum.

Nor does the comparison between Bu. and W. carry us much further. Some of the phonetic differences between the two dialects have been pointed out by L.[2] But it appears impossible to reduce them to any fixed rules, and in most cases we cannot guess which form is the more archaic one.

This is the case with Bu. miši·ndo, W. biši·ndo *five*, and with the words where a long vowel appears in W.

W. isko *three*, tshendo *five* have probably got their palatal vowel

[1] V. § 210.
[2] §§ 501 sqq.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920–4; 1934–5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



from the z. forms[1], and Bu. -susun *elbow*, bu'a[h][2] *cow* may also be more original than W. -seen, 'bis'.

In some cases a group of consonants seems to have been better preserved in W.: Cf. W. ayast *my sister;* yainli *watermill;* ɣendeš *gold;* nya *bear* with Bu. ayas, yäiŋ, gɣeniš, ya. But notice W. hučo (L. huti) *nine:* Bu. 'hunčo. Bu. gɣ- (acc. to my informant) may or may not be older than L.'s Bu. and W. ɣ-. For other details see below.

That biranč *mulberry*, W. braneš derives from an older form *mranč < *mrač is proved by Kho. mrač, from which the Bu.-W. word is evidently borrowed.

But apart from such stray cases the reconstruction of older forms through internal comparison appears to have poor chances of success.

---

A great number of words are common to Bu. and Shina, and to some extent also to Khowar. When the vocabularies of Shina and the adjoining Indo-Aryan dialects have become better known, it may be possible to distinguish to some extent between words of Aryan and of Bu. origin, and this will be of importance for the history of the Indo-Aryan languages as well. Khowar, however, appears to contain a number of words which cannot at present be traced either to an Indian, Iranian or Bu. source.

Grierson has pointed out that the word for *iron* in the Dardic and Kafir dialects (Kho. čumur, etc.) is probably borrowed from Bu. čumar. This may very well be the case, but it is, of course, possible that the ultimate source of the word, which is probably connected also with Turkish timur, temir, may be some unknown language. Note, however, that Bu. has also an apparently genuine word for *gold* (ɣeniš), and it is by no means impossible that the pre-Aryan population of the Hindu Kush region, of which the Burusho are the last relic, may have known the use of some metals.[3]

[1] V. above p. XX.

[2] Acc. to Lor. (2—4—1935) bu'a(·) is the gen. of 'bua, bua.

[3] It is a curious fact that Bu. girmi- *to write* is genuine, and yet cannot be derived from any known Bu. word. The similarity to Arm. gir *writing*, Finn. kirja *book* must, however, be accidental, and it is improbable that a word with this meaning would go back to very remote antiquity.

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



177
177
[829]
197
193

presumed from the possession of a pattern of door known as "Baloski hing" (balo·ski hiŋ), and a method of thorn-fencing "Baloski chash" (balo·ski čaš). See also Text No. XXVIII. I have even been told that the Burusho believe that they acquired the whole of their material culture from Baltistan. Though there is no territorial contact with Khowar, an occasional surprising common property in words suggests questions.

The Qirgiz and Balti languages may at once be dismissed as sources of any perceptible influence on Burushaski, and, with infinitely greater opportunity, Wakhi seems to have been equally impotent to make any general impression on it. There remains Shina. Clearly there are borrowings from Shina to be found in the Burushaski vocabulary. Words with characteristic Shina prefixes and endings may be assumed to be Shina e. g. Bu. ʌ-baš, ʌ-čɛ·mo, su-čɛ·mo, ʌ-šato; adjectives ending in -ɑ·ʈo, čʌmor-ɑ·ʈo, ɣʌliš-ɑ·ʈo; abstract nouns ending in -ɑ·r, -i.ɑ·r, and -e·i such as: dʌmijɑ·r, šuri.ɑ·r, šuguleːi etc. In Shina -o is a very common ending in nouns and the masculine singular of adjectives. Where such words are shared the probability lies that in Burushaski they are borrowings from Shina. Examples are: bɑ·go, bʌsko·čo, bidi·ro. Sometimes the final -o is lacking in the Burushaski form. In such cases is the -o of Shina possibly an addition to a Burushaski word? Such are:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bu. | ɣulk | Shn. | gulko | *covered water-tank* |
| | ɣuʈu·m | | guʈu·mo | *deep* |
| | hisk | | hɛ·sko | *loom* |
| | hukʌr | | hukʌ·ro | *tamarisk* |

Of undistinguished shared words it is for the Philologist to say whether they are of Indo-Aryan stock, and so presumably a contribution from Shina, or not. The same applies to similarities of a more radical character found in the sharing of syntactical practices and idiomatic usages, which seem to postulate direct translation from one language into the other. It is a fair hypothesis that such a process came into action at some time when the two languages were in intimate association, probably by intermarriage, after the

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



Shina-speaking stock had forced its way in among, or acquired domination over, an originally Burushaski-speaking population. To enumerate such similarities would require a treatise in itself, and in the Grammar I have purposely abstained from drawing comparisons with Shina, which would have taken up space and obscured the immediate issues. I may here just draw attention to a few points. V. § 43. There is much parallelism in the use of the Bu. suffix -an and the Sh.- -ɛk, -k (ɛk = one), e. g. Sh. ɛk manu-ju'k *a man*; a-pu'k *a little*; with pronouns: ko-vk *what person?*, jɛk-ɛk *something*, kača-k-ɛk *a certain number of*, cp. Bu. berum-an; with numerals: dai bai-ɛk *ten or a dozen*, bi-ɛk *a score*. It is also used with the plural and so corresponds to the Bu. -ik. Employed with passive participles and verbal bases it replaces the indefinite by a definite sense. Thus: rai.ituk *the thing said* cp. Bu. ɛnuman; ā-thi hanuk *the bones there are*, cp. Bu. maltaḷ biluman *the ghee there was*.

Points of similarity can also be found in the use of the case suffixes: Sh. jɛk čokɪj *how?*, cp. Bu. belaṭɛ. Sh. -ɪj = ajɛ is semantically parallel to Bu. -aṭɛ. Sh. abl. -jo, parallel to Bu. -tsum used with meaning *after* (of time). Among the pronouns, Sh. ɛk ɛk is parallel with Bu. hin hin *one another* v. § 134. Sh. baiyɛ *both* and bu-to pl. bu-tɛ *all* generally follow the noun: jɛk bu-tɛ *all the people*, cp. Bu. °-altalik and °-yo-n, §§ 177—178.

There is a parallelism between the use of the Sh. gɛ, gɛ and the Bu. kɛ with the indefinite pronouns when the verb is in the negative e. g. Sh. jɛgɛ nɪš, Bu. besan kɛ api *it is nothing*, v. §§ 148—154 and 333.

The higher numeral system of both languages is based on the score (20). In compound verbal expressions there is much parallelism in the use of the verbs *to come*, Sh. wai.o-ɪki Bu. ju-yas; *to bring*, Sh. walo-ɪki and aṭo-ɪki, Bu. d°-tas, dusu-yas, su-yas, v. §§ 261 ff. and 266, also in some other cases. These seem to be translations.

Parallelism of use can also be noted in some independent verbs e.g. Sh. nɪkhai.o-ɪki, Bu. du-as, *to come out, go out, get out, escape;*

3: Lorimer L-3 (1920-4; 1934-5) 1935 AV7 Burusho AV7



117
•113

*to cross* (*a river*; etc.) *to climb up; to win* (*in a game*). Both languages use the interrogative suffix -a with verbs, and use it in the same way, v. § 340.

There seems to be some parallelism in the verb *to be able*, Sh. bo·ɪki, which also means *to be, become*, and the Bu. °-amanas which is presumably related to manaˑs, v. § 298.6. Cp. also Kho. bik.

The Conditional particles Sh. tsɪk and Bu. tsɛ, Wer. tsɪk are largely similarly employed.

The extensive use of the past participle active and its employment as a connective are common to both languages. Sh. the *having said*, is used to close a quotation, exactly as the Bu. nuɛan, v. § 367. Cp. Kho. rɛ.

Sh. thoˑɪki and Bu. ɛtas, both meaning primarily *to do*, are always used for *to speak* (*a language*), and the Sh. constantly, and the Bu. sometimes, for *to say*.

There are correspondences in the use of the Sh. passive and static participles and the Bu. static participle, cp. raiˑituk mentioned above, also the active use in Sh. raiˑito manuˑjo *a man who has read* i.e. *a literate man*, v. § 378. b. With §§ 379. b. and 460 cp. Sh. wato o manuˑjo *the man who has come*.

The infinitive is used in Shina as in Burushaski with case suffixes, v. § 392. I. Curiously, the Sh. locative form in -ər in used in the same way as the Bu. dative form in -ər, as described in § 395 d. Is this a case of adoption? The same phenomenon is seen in the Sh. aɛaˑkər and the Bu. teˑrumanər, both expressing in the same way, *at this point, thereupon, then*, v. § 409 1.

As in Bu. so in Sh. the same or approximately the same form functions as infinitive, inflectable verbal noun, noun-agent and gerundive(?): thoˑɪki, thoˑk, *to do, doing* (noun); thoˑɪkɛjo fatu *after doing* (*it*); thoˑɪkɛt čak *ready to do it;* mas doˑɪki asulusus *I was a giver, prepared to give;* mas thoˑkunus, tus thoˑkuno, roˑs thoˑkun *I am to, have to, must do, thou must do, he must do;* aɛpɛ kuˑrɛ kərpa thoˑkun *it is necessary to cut the horse's hoofs, its hoofs are to be cut;* aɛpič tilɛn doˑkun (doˑɪki) *the saddle is to be put on the horse.*

In Sh. mat lɛl han-ɪj *on its being known to me* i.e. *with my knowledge*, mat lɛl nuš-ɪj *without my knowledge*, the use of the suffix -ɪj (ajɛ = *on*) may be compared with that of Bu. -aṭɛ in ayɛtum-aṭɛ etc. in § 384, and the combination of the base han with a case suffix, with o·ni-tsum and asqan-aṭɛ in § 407. b. and c. 197 193

The use of the past participle active of the verb *to do* in Bu. to form adverbial expressions is to be compared with the similar Sh. use of the ppc. of tho·iki viz. *the*, e.g. lo·ko thɛ *quickly*, miśto thɛ *well*, Bu. yar nɛ *forwards*, šu.a nɛ *well*, v. § 416. But while the Sh. adverbs so formed are usually Adverbs of Manner, those of Burushaski are mainly Adverbs of Place.

There is also much parallelism in the use of the Sh. particle *to* and the Bu. particle *ki* with temporal clauses and the protases of conditional sentences.

Some correspondences of a like nature can also be traced in Khowar. 192

Burushaski has also been in contact with certain foreign languages which geographically do not lie adjacent to it. These are Panjabi and Dogri, Hindustani, Persian and Arabic. One main point of contact has been provided by the Gilgit bazar, the marketing centre of Hunza and Nagir, where the shops are manned by a mixed crew of Panjabis, Kashmiris and local people, and are frequented by the Dogras of the garrison of Kashmir State Troops and the servants of local officials. Local people are also employed by various public departments, such as the Public Works Department, the Posts and Telegraphs and the Indian Army Service Corps, whose officials talk Hindustani. There are always a considerable number of Burusho resident in the Gilgit Wazārat, and small numbers are to be found in Srinagar and down country, even in Bombay. 177 [443]

Contact again is provided by the corps of Gilgit Scouts. Hunza and Nagir both provide two companies of 80 men each, who come up to Gilgit for training for a month (recently increased to two months) each year. Here they are trained by one or two British Officers, whose medium of communication is Hindustani, and they must thus pick up a certain limited Hindustani vocabulary.

1: Leitner L-3 (1866-93) 1893? AV3 Dard
Burusho AV 7



000 stimulus, but the course which we adopt of abstract generalisations, without analysing them and bringing them back to their concrete constituents, is almost a process of stultification.

197 177 Coming now to one of the most primitive, and certainly one of the remnants of pre-historic languages, that of Hunza, which I had the opportunity of examining twenty-three years ago, while Gilgit was in a state of warfare, and where I had to learn the language, so to speak, with a pencil in one hand and a weapon in the other, and surrounded by people who were waiting for an opportunity to kill me, I found, that on reverting to it three years ago, the language had already undergone a process of assimilation to the surrounding dialects, owing to the advance of so-called civilisation, which in that case, and which in the case of most of these tribes, means the introduction of drunkenness and disease, in this instance of cholera, for we know what has been the condition of those countries which lie in the triangle between Cashmere, Kabul, and Badakhshan, and to which I first gave the name of Dardistan in 1866.

193 Now, what does this language show us? There the ordinary methods proved entirely at fault. If one pointed to an object, quite apart from the ordinary difficulties of misapprehension, the man appealed to, for instance, might say "your finger," if a finger were the thing of which he thought you wanted the name. If not satisfied with the name given in response, and you turned to somebody else, another name was obtained; and if you turned to a third person, you got a third name.

What was the reason for these differences? It was this, that the language had not emerged from the state in which it is impossible to have such a word as "head," as distinguished from "my head," or "thy head," or "his head"; for instance, *ak* is "my name," and *ik* is "his name." Take away the pronominal sign, and you are left with *k*, which means nothing. *Aus* is "my wife," and *gus* "thy wife." The *s* alone has no meaning, and, in some cases, it seemed impossible to arrive at putting anything down correctly; but so it is in the initial stage of a language. In the Hunza language under discussion, that stage is important to us as members of the Aryan group, as the dissociation of the pronoun, verb, adverb and conjunction from the act or substance only occurs when the language emerges beyond the stage when the

1: Leitner L-3 (1866-93) 1893? AV3 Dard 6575
Burush. AV7



groping, as it were, of the human child between the *mumm* and *tuum*, the first and second persons, approaches the clear perception of the outer world, the "*suum*," the third person. Now, during the twenty years referred to "his" (house), "his" (name), and "his" (head) are beginning to take the place of "house," "name," "head," generally, in not quite a decided manner, but still they are taking their place. When I subsequently talked to the Hunzas, and tried to find a reason for that "idiom," if one may use the term, it seemed very clear and convincing when they said, "How is it possible for 'a wife' to exist unless she is somebody's wife?" "You cannot say, for instance, if you dissociate the one from the other, 'her wife,' or 'his husband.' 'Head,' by itself, does not exist; it must be somebody's head." When, again, you dissociate the sound which stands for the action or substance from the pronoun, you come, in a certain group of words, to another range of thought connected with the primary family relation, and showing the existence of that particularly ancient form of endogamy, in which all the elder females are the mothers and all the elder men are the fathers of the tribe. For instance, take a word like "mother;" "m" would mean the female principle, "o" would be the self, and the *ther* would mean "the tribe;" in other words, "mother" would mean: "the female that bore me and that belongs to my tribe." Now, fanciful as this may appear to us, it is the simple fact as regards the Hunza language, which, when put the test of analysis, will throw an incredible light on the history of Aryan words. For instance, taking Sanskrit as a typical language, you will, I believe, find how the early relations grew, and you will get beyond the root into the parts of which the root is made up; each of which has a meaning, not in one or two instances, but in most. I am not going to read you the volume which I am preparing for the Indian Government, and which is only the first part of the analysis with regard to this language, and only a very small portion indeed of the material that I collected in 1866, 1872, and 1884 regarding that important part of the world, Dardistan, which is now being drawn within the range of practical Indian politics—a region situated between the Hindukush and Kaghan (lat. 37° N. and long. 73° E to lat. 35° N. and long. 74·3° E.) and comprising monarchies and republics, including a small

[2+1]

Biddulph G-3 (1873-1878) 1880 AVS Afghanistan AVS
4
AVS Dard AVS
Burushe AVS



The grammar of the Shina[1] language may be taken as fairly typical of that of the languages spoken by the broken tribes in the Indus, Swat, Kooner, and Punjkorah Valleys. Though differing slightly among themselves, these all grade into one another, and into Punjabi, and a closer examination will probably show that they have some affinity with Cashmeri. As in Punjabi and Hindustani, distinctions of gender are preserved in nouns and verbs, and the use of the cerebral *n* and the soft *j* is very common. In Shina, Torwalik, and Bushkarik[2] the passive voice is formed by the use of the auxiliary verb "to go," as in Punjabi and Hindustani.

The verbs of the two latter languages of the Swat Valley differ from those of Shina in having only one masculine and one feminine form in the singular, and a different single form for the plural, while the Gowro and Chiliss[3] differ in having the same form both in the singular and plural.

The most singular and interesting language of all is the Boorishki,[4] spoken in Hunza, Nager, and Yassin. It stands by itself and cannot be classed with any other Dard language. The foundation of this language has been identified as of Turanian origin; but, as far as I am able to judge, it has little or no claim to be classed as a Toork language, and it has forms which are only found among the most primitive races. Besides this, it has at some period borrowed largely from some Aryan language, many of the gramatical forms of which it has adopted. While preserving distinctions of gender, both in verbs and nouns, it uses them in a totally different manner from any of the Dard languages. The use of the celebral *n* is rare, and the verbs have no passive voice, though in the active voice they have the same tenses as exist in Khowar, Shina, and other Dard languages.

Under the convenient term of Dardistan have been included the whole of the valleys lying between the Western Punjab and the Hindoo Koosh, which are inhabited by a number of tribes mostly of Aryan origin. The greater part of these tribes appear to have been gradually crowded up into the less accessible and desirable localities, by external pressure. The circumstances which have caused them to quit their former homes have not, apparently, been simultaneous, or even of the same nature in all cases.

The name "Dard" is not acknowledged by any section of the tribes to whom it has been so sweepingly applied. In a single instance, the term is applied by one tribe to some of

[1] Appendix B. [2] Appendices D & E. [3] Appendices F and C. [4] Appendix A.